



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,343	07/08/2003	Gabor Bajko	59643.00228	7843
32294 7590 08/02/2007 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 14TH FLOOR 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			EXAMINER FRINK, JOHN MOORE	
			ART UNIT 2142	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/614,343		BAJKO, GABOR	
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	John M. Frink	2142		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 and 46-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 and 46-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 11, 14 – 17, 19, 20, 22 – 29, 31, 33 – 35, 38, 39 and 43 - 48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings and Peterson (RFC 3325 Internet Draft, <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-sip-asserted-identity-00>, May 27, 2002), hereafter Jennings, in view of W. Marshall et al. (draft-ietf-sip-privacy-04.txt, February 27, 2002), hereafter Marshall.

3. Regarding claims 1 and 46, Jennings shows a security server receiving a message (Section 5, hereafter abbreviated as '5'); determining whether the message has been through a security check (5), and forwarding the message within the telecommunications network regardless of the result of the determination (3, 5 and 8).

Jennings does not show if the result of the determination is that the message has not been through a security check, modifying the message so as to indicate that the message has not been through a security check.

Marshall shows if the result of the determination is that the message has not been through a security check, modifying the message so as to indicate that the message has not been through a security check (6.1 and 7.5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Jennings with that of Marshall because both disclosures are IETF drafts addressing SIP, and are thus designed to complement each other and be used together.

4. Regarding claim 2, Jennings in view of Marshall show receiving a message from outside the telecommunications network (Jennings, 3, 5 and 10.2).

5. Regarding claim 3, Jennings in view of Marshall show wherein the security server is configured to modify the message so as to indicate that the message has not been through a security check by adding a parameter to the message that indicates that the message has not been through a security check (Jennings, 4 and 5, Marshall 7.5, paragraph 5).

6. Regarding claim 4, Jennings in view of Marshall show where the security server is configured to receive a message that includes an identity header and is further configured to add the parameter to the identity header of the message (Jennings 4 and 5).

7. Regarding claim 5, Jennings in view of Marshall show where the message comprises a SIP message (Jennings 5).

8. Regarding claim 6, Jennings in view of Marshall show where the identity header comprises a P-Asserted-Identity (Jennings 5).

9. Regarding claim 7, Jennings in view of Marshall show receiving a message that includes an identity header and where said security server is further configured to

modify the message so as to indicate that the message has not been through a security check by removing at least part of the identity header (Jennings 7, Marshall 7.5).

10. Regarding claim 8, Jennings in view of Marshall show a security server configured to detect whether the identity header is of a particular type and if so to remove at least part of the header (Jennings 7).

11. Regarding claim 9, Jennings in view of Marshall show where the message comprises a SIP message (Jennings 7).

12. Regarding claim 10, Jennings in view of Marshall show detecting whether the identity header comprises a P-Asserted-Identity type (Jennings 7).

13. Regarding claim 11, Jennings in view of Marshall show a security server according to claim 1, wherein the security server is configured to determine whether the message has been through a security check by determining whether or not the message has been received via a secure means (Jennings 9.1 and 11.2 – 11.4, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

14. Regarding claims 14 and 47, Jennings in view of Marshall show a network processing element for use in a telecommunications network, the network processing element configured to: receive a message from another network element; determine whether the message has been modified to indicate that it has not been through a security check and, if it has been so modified, perform one or more security checks in respect of the message (Jennings, 4,5, and 11.2 – 11.4, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

15. Regarding claim 15, Jennings in view of Marshall show a network processing element according to claim 14, wherein the network processing element is configured to

Art Unit: 2142

determine whether an identity header of the message has been modified to indicate that it has not been through a security check by detecting whether the identity header of the message includes an added parameter (Jennings 5 and Marshall 6.1).

16. Regarding claim 16, Jennings in view of Marshall show a network processing element according to claim 15, wherein the message comprises a SIP message (Jennings 5).

17. Regarding claim 17, Jennings in view of Marshall show a network processing element according to claim 15, wherein the identity header comprises a P-Asserted-Identity (Jennings 5).

18. Regarding claim 22, Jennings in view of Marshall show a telecommunications network comprising a security server and a network processing element, the security server being configured to receive a message; determine whether the message has been through a security check (Marshall 6.1), if the result of the determination is that the message has not been through a security check modify the message so as to indicate that the message has not been through a security check (Marshall 7.4) and forward the message to the network processing element regardless of the result of the determination (Jennings 4 and 5).

19. Regarding claim 23, Jennings in view of Marshall show a telecommunications network according to claim 22, wherein the security server is configured to receive a message from outside the telecommunications network (Jennings 3, 5 and 10.2).

20. Regarding claim 24, Jennings in view of Marshall show a telecommunications network according to claim 22, wherein the network processing element is configured

Art Unit: 2142

to: receive a message forwarded by the security server; and determine whether the message has been modified and, determine whether the message has been modified so as to indicate that it has not been through a security check, and, if it has been so modified, perform one or more security checks in respect of the message (Jennings, 7, Marshall 6.1).

21. Regarding claim 25, Jennings in view of Marshall show receiving a message that has not been through a security check, determining that the message has not been through a security check, modifying the message so as to indicate that the message has not been through a security check, and forwarding the message within the telecommunications network. (Jennings 3 – 5, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5)

22. Regarding claims 26, 33, 43 and 48, Jennings in view of Marshall show a security server for use in a telecommunications network, the security server configured to: receive a message; determine whether the message has been through a security check and forward the message within the communications network regardless of the result of the determination but, if the result of the determination is that the message has not been through a security check, forward the message in a manner that indicates that the message has not been through a security check (Jennings 3 – 5, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

23. Regarding claims 27 and 34, Jennings in view of Marshall show wherein the security server is configured to receive the message from outside the telecommunications network (Jennings 3, 5 and 10.2).

Art Unit: 2142

24. Regarding claim 28, Jennings in view of Marshall show a security server according to claim 26, wherein the security server is configured to forward the message without security, if it is determined that the message has not been through a security check (Jennings 8, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

25. Regarding claim 29, Jennings in view of Marshall show a security server according to claim 26, wherein the security server is configured to forward the message with security, if it is determined that the message has been through a security check (Jennings 8 and 11.2 – 11.5, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

26. Regarding claims 31 and 38, Jennings in view of Marshall show a security server according to claim 26, wherein the message comprises a SIP message (Jennings 3 -5).

27. Regarding claim 34, Jennings in view of Marshall show a telecommunications network according to claim 33, wherein the security server is configured to receive a message from outside the telecommunications network (Sections 3, 5 and 10.2).

28. Regarding claim 35, Jennings in view of Marshall show the telecommunications network according to claim 33, further comprising: an internal security system, wherein the security server is configured to forward the message via the internal security system, if it is determined that the message has been through a security check, and wherein the security system is configured to not forward the message via the internal security system, if it is determined that the message has not been through a security check (Jennings 8 and 11.2 – 11.5, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

29. Regarding claim 39, Jennings in view of Marshall show a telecommunications network according to claim 33, wherein the security server is configured to determine

whether a message has been through a security check by determining whether or not the message has been received via a secure means (Jennings 9.1 and 11.2 – 11.4, Marshall 6.1).

30. Claims 12, 30, 37 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings in view of Marshall as applied to claim 1, 28, 33, and 39 above, and further in view of Arkko et al. (US 2002/0052200 A1).

31. Regarding claim 12, Jennings in view of Marshall show a security server according to claim 11 (Jennings 3, 5, 11.2, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

Jennings in view of Marshall do not show where the secure means is a Za interface.

Arkko et al. shows where the secure means is a Za interface (Fig. 1, Fig.4, [0040 - 0043]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Jennings in view of Marshall with that of Arkko et al. in order to utilize a common security protocol which is intended to be used to enable the secure exchange of information in systems like Jennings' and Marshall's (Arkko et al., [0040 - 0041]).

32. Regarding claim 30, Jennings in view of Marshall show a security server according to claim 28 (Jennings 8, Marshall 6.1).

Jennings in view of Marshall do not show where the secure means is a Zb interface.

Art Unit: 2142

Arkko et al. shows where the secure means is a Zb interface (Fig. 1, Fig.4, [0040 - 0043]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Jennings in view of Marshall with that of Arkko et al. in order to utilize a common security protocol which is intended to be used to enable the secure exchange of information in systems Jennings' and Marshall's (Arkko et al., [0040 - 0043]).

33. Regarding claim 37, Jennings in view of Marshall and Arkko et al. further disclose a telecommunications network according to claim 35, wherein the internal security system comprises a Zb interface (Peterson, Sections 8 and 11.2 – 11.5; Arkko et al., [0040 - 0043]).

34. Regarding claim 41, Jennings in view Marshall and Arkko et al. further disclose a telecommunications network according to claim 39, wherein the secure means comprises a Za interface (Peterson, Sections 9.1 and 11.2 – 11.4; Arkko et al., [0040 - 0043]).

35. Claims 13, 21, 32 and 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings in view of Marshall as applied to claims 1, 14 and 33 above, further in view of Soininen (RFC 3574 Internet Draft, <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-v6ops-3gpp-cases-00>, September, 2002).

36. Regarding claim 13, Jennings and in view of Marshall show a security server according to claim 1 (Jennings 3, 5, 11.2, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

Jennings and in view of Marshall and do not show where the security server comprises an interrogating call session control function.

Soininen shows where the security server comprises an interrogating call session control function (Section 3.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Jennings and in view of Marshall and with that of Soininen in order to provide for an SIP system adhering to the 3GPP networking standard (Soininen, Section 3.2).

37. Regarding claim 21, Jennings and in view of Marshall and Soininen further show a network processing element according to claim 14, that comprises a serving call session control function (Jennings, Sections 4, 5, and 11.2 – 11.4; Soininen, Section 3.2).

38. Regarding claim 32, Jennings and in view of Marshall and Soininen further show a security server according to claim 26, wherein the security server comprises an interrogating call session control function (Jennings, Sections 3 – 5; Soininen, Section 3.2).

39. Regarding claim 42, Jennings and in view of Marshall and Soininen further show a telecommunications network according to claim 33, wherein the security server comprises an interrogating call session control function (Jennings, Sections 3 – 5; Soininen, Section 3.2).

40. Claims 18, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings in view of Marshall as applied to claim 14 above, further in view of

Art Unit: 2142

Peterson (RFC 3323 Internet Draft, <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-sip-privacy-general-00>, May 27, 2002).

41. Regarding claim 18, Jennings in view of Marshall disclose a network processing element according to claim 14 (Jennings 4, 5 and 11.2 – 11.4, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

Jennings in view of Marshall do not disclose where said network processing element is configured to determine whether the message has been modified by determining whether all or part an identity header of the message has been removed.

Peterson discloses where said network processing element is configured to determine whether the message has been modified by determining whether all or part an identity header of the message has been removed (6.1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the disclosure of Jennings in view of Marshall with that of Peterson so that after header values have been obscured to preserve privacy when communicating with an entity that is not trusted, it is determinable that said header values were originally present so that said header values can said header values may be restored. This enables said header values to be 'recoverable when further messages in the dialog need to be routed to the originating user agent' which is an important part of maintaining header privacy (Peterson, 6.1)

42. Regarding claim 19, Jennings in view of Marshall and Peterson further show a network processing element according to claim 18, wherein the message comprises a SIP message (Jennings, Sections 4, 5 and 11.2 – 11.4; Peterson, Abstract and 6.1).

43. Regarding claim 20, Jennings in view of Marshall and Peterson further show a network processing element according to claim 18, wherein the identity header comprises a P-Asserted-Identity (Jennings, 5; Peterson, 6.1).

44. Claims 36 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings in view of Marshall as applied to claim 35 above, further in view of Haukka (US 2003/0210678 A1).

45. Regarding claim 36, Jennings in view of Marshall show a telecommunications network according to claim 35 (Jennings, 8 and 11.2 – 11.5, Marshall 6.1 and 7.5).

Jennings in view of Marshall do not show where the internal security system comprises a UMTS specified security system.

Haukka shows where the internal security system comprises a UMTS specified security system ([0021 - 0023]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the disclosure of Jennings in view of Marshall with that of Haukka in order to provide support for a UMTS network, a common environment utilizing SIP (Haukka, Figs. 1 and 2), which is what Jennings' and Marshall's disclosure was designed to support.

46. Regarding claim 40, Jennings in view of Marshall and Haukka further disclose a telecommunications network according to claim 39, wherein the secure means comprises a UMTS standard security means (Jennings, Sections 9.1 and 11.2 – 11.4; Haukka, [0021 - 0023]).

Response to Arguments

47. Applicant's arguments, filed 6/29/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Marshall (draft-ietf-sip-privacy-04.txt).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Frink whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2142

9686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 5:00PM EST; off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John Frink

(571) 272-9686



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER